

Worksheet
Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

Note: This worksheet is to be completed consistent with the policies stated in the Instruction Memorandum entitled “Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Adequacy” transmitting this worksheet and the “Guidelines for Using the DNA Worksheet” located at the end of the worksheet. (Note: The signed CONCLUSION at the end of this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM’s internal analysis process and does not constitute an appealable decision.)

Lease/Serial/Case File No. DOI-BLM-AZ-P010-2014-0009-DNA

A. BLM Office: Hassayampa FO

Proposed Action Title/Type: Lake Pleasant Herd Management Area Census

Description of the Proposed Action: BLM proposes to conduct an aerial population estimate, using the simultaneous double count method for the wild burro population in and around the Lake Pleasant Herd Management Area (HMA). The HMA is located approximately 30 miles to the north west of Phoenix, is bordered on the south end by Highway 74 and is approximately 3 miles to the west of Interstate 17. The HMA consists of approximately 121,000 acres within its boundaries. This action requires the use of a low level helicopter flight over the HMA and the Hell’s Canyon Wilderness area. The area to be flown will be approximately 155,000 acres in size. Flights during the census will be conducted between 175 and 225 feet above ground level (AGL).

B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans

LUP Name*	<u>Bradshaw-Harquahala Resource Management Plan</u>	Date Approved:	<u>2010</u>
Other document**	<u>Lake Pleasant Burro Herd Management Plan</u>	Date Approved:	<u>1999</u>
Other document**	<u>Hell’s Canyon Wilderness MP</u>	Date Approved:	<u>1995</u>

*List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans or applicable amendments).

**List applicable activity, project, management, water quality restoration, or program plans.

☒ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

Bradshaw-Harquahala Resource Management Plan /EIS

p. A-40 “Continue to monitor burro numbers and habitat conditions in the Lake Pleasant Herd Management Area.”

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions) and, if applicable, implementation plan decisions:

C. Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

Bradshaw-Harquahala Resource Management Plan /EIS 2010

Lake Pleasant Burro Herd Management Plan/EA 1999

Hell’s Canyon Wilderness Management Plan/EA 1995

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., source drinking water assessments, biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, rangeland health standard’s assessment and determinations, and monitoring the report).

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, the proposed action alternative is covered in the RMP/EIS, Wilderness Management Plan and the Lake Pleasant Herd Area Management Plan

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, the range of alternatives was adequate.

3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (including, for example, riparian proper functioning condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; Unified Watershed Assessment categorizations; inventory and monitoring data; most recent Fish and Wildlife Service lists of threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species; most recent BLM lists of sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, the circumstances surrounding the past reviews still apply and there are no new resource issues.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, the proposed action has not changed from the preferred alternative described in the RMP and Management Plans. The process used in the documentation is the agency standard for this type of action.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, the direct and indirect impacts are essentially the same as those identified and analyzed in the RMP/EIS and Management Plans.

6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, the proposed action is in the range of reasonable, foreseeable developments that are discussed.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequately for the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, public involvement and interagency review of the RMP and Management Plans was

adequate and covers the proposed action.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource Represented</u>
<u>Cody Carter</u>	<u>Wildlife Biologist</u>	<u>Wildlife/T&E</u>
<u>Mary Skordinsky</u>	<u>Resource Advisor</u>	<u>Wilderness</u>

F. Mitigation Measures: List any applicable mitigation measures that were identified, analyzed, and approved in relevant LUPs and existing NEPA document(s). List the specific mitigation measures or identify an attachment that includes those specific mitigation measures. Document that these applicable mitigation measures must be incorporated and implemented.

The attachment census proposal contains all applicable mitigation measures from the referenced RMP and NEPA documents.

CONCLUSION

☒ Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Wilderness resources or users within the Hell's Canyon wilderness area will not be impacted. The inventory will be completed by helicopter during the hot weather season when there is a near 100% probability of no visitor use. An accurate herd count will also contribute, over the long-term, to better wild burro management and well-managed range conditions within the wilderness, with a reduced potential for weeds, and lessened effects on soils and vegetation.

Note: If one or more of the criteria are not met, a conclusion of conformance and/or NEPA adequacy cannot be made and this box cannot be checked

/S/

Signature of the Responsible Official

02/25/2014
Date

